

G. ~~Schaer~~

B164

JV Public Forum Debate Ballot

Tourn. date: Nov. 19, 2016 Time: 1:00 PM		Tournament: Randolph Fall Classic	
Rd. 3A	Room: B164	Grouping: J-PF Section: F	Judge: Gregory Schaer (P9) Affiliation/ Occupation: Freehold Township High School (P9)
Debaters: Manya Sampath and Anirudh Maddali (E4) vs. Aban Gu and Rehman Hanceel (G8)			
Resolution --			

EVERY round begins with a coin toss; the winning team has the option of choosing either the side (pro or con) or the speaking order (first or second) in the round; the losing team makes the remaining choice, either side or speaking order.

AFTER the coin toss, record the following (the team on the left speaks first and should sit to the judge's left):

First Team			Second Team		
School: E4	Side: <input type="checkbox"/> Pro <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Con	Spkr Points (out of 30)	School: G8	Side: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Spkr Points (out of 30)
Speaker 1 Name: Manya Sampath		28.5	Speaker 2 Name: Aban Gu		28.5
Speaker 3 Name: Anirudh Maddali		28.5	Speaker 4 Name: Rehman Hanceel		28.5

Rate each SPEAKER 30=Excellent. 29-29.5=Very Good, 27-28.5=Good, 26-26.5=Needs Improvement, 25=Inappropriate (half points allowed, tenths are not allowed)

Winning Team: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pro <input type="checkbox"/> Con	Winning Team/Code: G8	Low point win?
Judge's signature:		

- Judges should decide the round as it is debated, not based on their personal beliefs.
- Debaters should advocate or reject the resolution in manner clear to the non-specialist citizen judge (i.e., jury). Clash of ideas is essential to debate.
- Debaters should display solid logic and reasoning, advocate a position, utilize evidence, and communicate clear ideas using professional decorum.
- Neither the pro nor con is permitted to offer a plan or counterplan, defined as a formalized, comprehensive proposal for implementation. Rather, they should offer reasoning to support a position of advocacy. Debaters may offer generalized, practical solutions.
- Crossfire time should be dedicated to questions and answers rather than reading evidence. Evidence may be referred to extemporaneously.
- No new arguments may be introduced in the Final Focus; however, debaters may include new evidence to support prior arguments.

Comments to debaters:

~~Manya~~ - Nice speaking style - try to maintain eye contact from time to time. Very nice ~~and~~ style and questioning during crossfire.

~~Anirudh~~ (Nice style and ~~filling~~ during crossfire. Nice passion and enthusiasm)

Comments to debaters:

~~Aban~~ - Nice style and humorous touch. Great logic + quirky as your feet.

~~Rehman~~ - Very nice presentation and good interjection of logic and sense ~~of~~ ~~humor~~.

Reasons for Decision (cite specific arguments that had a bearing):

Both teams were very skilled and persuasive. PRO won full debate in the end because they proved that the benefits of IoT include ~~many~~ benefits in education, banking ~~and~~ health + water. Con's arguments about numbers was compelling but even though the impact maybe limited, it still was large enough to outweigh the harms cited by con.

Order/Time Limits of Speeches	
Speaker 1	4 min.
Speaker 2	4 min.
Crossfire (1 & 2)*	3 min.
Speaker 3	4 min.
Speaker 4	4 min.
Crossfire (3 & 4)*	3 min.
Speaker 1 Summary	2 min.
Speaker 2 Summary	2 min.
Grand Crossfire (all)	3 min.
Speaker 3 Final Focus	2 min.
Speaker 4 Final Focus	2 min.

2 minutes of Prep Time per side
* The first question is asked by the earlier speaker

https://www.speechwiretwo.com/tabroom/judges-ballot-debate.php?selgroupingid=0&sel... 11/19/2016
 * Most importantly, both teams were very respectful of each other - which was

I noticed and appreciated many sportsmanship and character by both teams.